

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. BOX 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22013-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	ICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/084,836	02/26/2002		Frederick L. Jordan	ORYXE.025A 3050		
20995	7590	09/29/2003				
KNOBBE M 2040 MAIN S		S OLSON & E	EXAMINER			
FOURTEENT	H FLOC)R	TOOMER, CEPHIA D			
IRVINE, CA	92014			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				1714		
				DATE MAILED: 09/29/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/084,836	JORDAN, FREDERICK L.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Cephia D. Toomer	1714				
	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	<u> </u>					
Period f	r Reply						
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu - Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. In period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be till y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE.	mely filed ys will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
2a)□		is action is non-final.					
3)	,—		rosecution as to the merits is	3			
, , ,	closed in accordance with the practice under on of Claims						
4)🖂	Claim(s) 1-48 is/are pending in the application).					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	wn from consideration.					
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-48</u> is/are rejected.						
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.					
9)	The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accep	oted or b) objected to by the Exa	miner.				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. S	See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
11) 🗌 .	The proposed drawing correction filed on	_ is: a)□ approved b)□ disappro	oved by the Examiner.				
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in rep	oly to this Office action.					
12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.							
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120						
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).							
a)[☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:						
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.					
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received in Applicat	ion No				
* 5	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bursee the attached detailed Office action for a list	reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
14) 🗌 🗛	cknowledgment is made of a claim for domesti	c priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional applicatio	n).			
_)	• •					
Attachmen							
2) Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of Informal	y (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152)				
U.S. Patent and Tr	rademark Office						

PTOL-326 (Rev. 04-01)

Art Unit: 1714

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Double Patenting

2. Claims 1-13, 17-34 and 34-48 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 16, 17, 19, 20, 23 and 24 of copending Application No. 10/084602. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the resid fuel of the present invention is encompassed by the generic hydrocarbon fuel of the copending application. Also, the ranges of the components overlap.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

3. Claims 1-16 and 26-37 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6, 21-30 and 33-36 of copending Application No. 10/084579. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the scope of the claims is the same and the additive is disclosed in the fuel application. Applicant's additive claims are open to the addition of the fuel. Furthermore, the use of

Art Unit: 1714

the fuel in conjunction with the additive would infringe the claims of the additive and the use of the present additive in the fuel would infringe the fuel composition.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 1, 4-6, 9-11, 13, 24-28, 30, 33 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Jordan (US 5,826,369).

Jordan teaches a carbonaceous fuel composition comprising a fuel additive of beta-carotene, chlorophyll, ethoxylated castor oil, jojoba oil and alkyl nitrates (see abstract; col. 2, lines 11-22). The carbonaceous fuel includes gasoline, diesel fuel, heavy fuel oil (resid), etc. (see col. 2, lines 23-43). The fuel additive may be diluted with a solvent such as gasoline, toluene, diesel fuel and alcohols (see col. 2, line 60 through col. 3, lines 1-6). Jordan teaches that the ethoxylated castor oil provides enhanced combustion characteristics and reductions in pollutant emissions.

3. Accordingly, Jordan teaching all the limitations of the claims anticipates the claims.

Art Unit: 1714

4. Claims 1 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schur (US 5,160,506).

Schur teaches a fuel composition comprising a liquid fuel mixture, a vegetable oil, an ageing inhibitor, an oxidation inhibitor and other conventional additives (see col. 1, lines 27-33; col. 2, lines 30-39,45-68).

Accordingly, Schur teaching all the limitations of the claims, anticipates the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 12, 43, 45, 47 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jordan (US 5,826,369).

Jordan has been discussed above. Jordan differs from the claim in that he does not specifically teach that the alcohol solvent is methanol or ethanol. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have selected these alcohol because Jordan broadly teaches alcohols, which encompasses methanol and ethanol, and Jordan teaches that any organic solvent may be used provided that it does not adversely increase pollutant emission levels.

Art Unit: 1714

Page 5

Jordan also fails to teach the claimed proportions of the components in the method claims. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to optimize these result effective variables because Jordan teaches the ratio of these components and he shows that the range may vary considerably in relation to the fuel and the combustion conditions. See col. 3, lines 14-21.

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is cited for teaching the general state of the art and is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cephia D. Toomer whose telephone number is 703-308-2509. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on 703-306-2777. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

Cebhia D. Toomer Primary Examiner Art Unit 1714

10/084836\091703